2004 - 2005 Michigan School Readiness Program

Program Quality Assessment

Statewide Data Report

Prepared by
High/Scope Educational Research Foundation

September 2005

Submitted to
Lindy Buch, Ph.D.
Michigan Department of Education

Introduction

The following report summarizes Michigan School Readiness Program (MSRP) classroom quality data collected during the 2004 - 2005 program year's Mid-Year Report process. Specifically, Program Quality Assessment (PQA) scores are described. There are two important factors to keep in mind when considering the PQA data from the 2004 - 2005 program year. First, all of these scores are self-reported. The self-reported nature of the data introduces the potential for higher score reporting by teachers than an outside observer might have scored the same classrooms. Second, this data was produced using the new second edition of the PQA. As explained in the administration manual of the revised PQA, the first edition's old scoring rules produced scores of a 4 or 5 even when programs were actually more variable in their levels of quality[1]. Scoring rules for the revised PQA have been changed such that a more normal distribution of scores is produced based on observed and documented program characteristics. The 2003 – 2004 reporting period was the first time that the new PQA scoring rules were used by MSRP grantees. It was found at that time that despite scoring rule changes, the self-report nature of the data continued to inflate scores.

As shown in Table 1 below, this also appears to be the case for the current 2004 – 2005 reporting period. With the exception of the Program Management sub-scale, average PQA scores have gone up from last year. Scores on the PQA can range from 1 to 5, with 1 representing low quality and 5 representing exceptional quality. A useful way to interpret PQA scores is that scores less than 3 indicate low quality, scores between 3 and 4.49 indicate medium quality, and scores at or above 4.5 indicate high quality. Table 1 shows that MSRP programs considered themselves to be on average high quality programs in some areas and closely approaching high quality in all others. .

---

[1] High/Scope Educational Research Foundation. (2003). *Preschool Program Quality Assessment 2nd edition Administration Manual.* Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press.

Table 1: Total and Sub-scale Average Scores Over Time

	2003-2004 Mean Score (n=1,127)	2004-2005 Mean Score (n=1075)	Change from PY03-PY04	% change
Total PQA Score	**4.28**	**4.39**	**0.11**	**2.57**
I. Learning Environment	4.12	4.25	0.13	3.16
II. Daily Routine	4.2	4.32	0.12	2.86
III. Adult-Child Interaction	4.46	4.54	0.08	1.79
IV. Curriculum Planning and Assessment	4.19	4.30	0.11	2.63
V. Parent Involvement and Family Services	4.54	4.58	0.04	0.88
VI. Staff Qualifications and Development	4.12	4.53	0.41	9.95
VII. Program Management	4.37	4.23	-0.14	-3.20

Of the total 1,103 classrooms in the PY04 dataset reported on here, 80% were run by school districts. And 97% were center based. Table 2 shows that there are some differences in how classrooms housed within school districts and competitive agencies rated themselves. Specifically, there was a statically significant difference in average scores for all sub-scales except Learning Environment and Daily Routine. School districts on average rated themselves higher in Adult-Child Interaction and Program Management. Competitive agencies on average rated themselves higher on Curriculum Planning and Assessment, Parent Involvement and Family Services, and Staff Qualifications.

Table 2: PQA Scale Scores by Program Type

	School District	Competitive Agency
I. Learning Environment	4.25	4.25
II. Daily Routine	4.32	4.34
III. Adult-Child Interaction**	4.56	4.46
IV. Curriculum Planning and Assessment***	4.26	4.48
V. Parent Involvement and Family Services**	4.57	4.65
VI. Staff Qualifications and Development*	4.20	4.29
VII. Program Management***	4.55	4.44
Total PQA Score	4.38	4.41

 * p ≤ .05; ** p ≤ .01; *** p ≤ .001

Areas In Need of Improvement

Table 3 shows three different thresholds that can be used to identify areas in need of improvement. The first is the standard of 10% or more of classrooms scoring at or below 3 on a particular item. The second threshold is 25% or more of classrooms that scored at or below 3. The third threshold is 10% of classrooms scored at or below 2. Table 4 provides average scores for every PQA item.

Table 3: PQA Items with Low to Medium Quality Across Classrooms

	10% or more scoring ≤ 3	25% or more scoring ≤ 3	10% or more scoring ≤ 2
I. Learning Environment			
A. Safe and healthy environment			
B. Defined interest areas			
C. Logically located interest areas	√		
D. Outdoor space, equipment, materials	√		
E. Organization and labeling of materials	√	√	
F. Varied and open-ended materials	√		
G. Plentiful materials	√		
H. Diversity-related materials	√	√	
I. Displays of child initiated work	√	√	
II. Daily Routine			
A. Consistent daily routine			
B. Parts of the day	√		
C. Appropriate time for each part of day			
D. Time for child planning	√	√	
E. Time for child-initiated activities	√		
F. Time for child recall	√	√	
G. Small-group time	√	√	√
H. Large-group time	√		
I. Choices during transition times	√		
J. Cleanup time with reasonable choices			
K. Snack or meal time	√		
L. Outside time	√		
III. Adult-Child Interaction			
A. Meeting basic physical needs			
B. Handling separation from home			
C. Warm and caring atmosphere			
D. Support for child communication			
E. Support for non-English speakers	√		
F. Adults as partners in play	√		
G. Encouragement of child initiatives			
H. Support for child learning at group times	√		
I. Opportunities for child exploration	√		
J. Acknowledgement of child efforts	√	√	√
K. Encouragement for peer interaction			
L. Independent problem solving			
M. Conflict resolution	√		

Table 3: PQA Items with Low to Medium Quality Across Classrooms (continued)

	10% or more scoring ≤ 3	25% or more scoring ≤ 3	10% or more scoring ≤ 2
IV. Curriculum Planning and Assessment			
A. Curriculum model	√		
B. Team teaching	√	√	√
C. Comprehensive child records			
D. Anecdotal note taking by staff	√	√	
E. Use of child observation measure			
V. Parent Involvement and Family Services			
A. Opportunities for involvement			
B. Parents on policy-making committees	√	√	√
C. Parent participation in child activities			
D. Sharing of curriculum information	√	√	
E. Staff-parent informal interactions			
F. Extending learning at home	√		
G. Formal meetings with parents			
H. Diagnostic/special education services			
I. Service referrals as needed			
J. Transition to kindergarten	√		
VI. Staff Qualifications and Development			
A. Program director background	√		√
B. Instructional staff background	√		
C. Support staff orientation and supervision			
D. Ongoing professional development	√	√	
E. Inservice training content and methods	√		
F. Observation and feedback	√		
G. Professional organization affiliation	√	√	√
VII. Program Management			
A. Program licensed			
B. Continuity in instructional staff			
C. Program assessment	√		
D. Recruitment and enrollment plan	√		
E. Operating policies and procedures			
F. Accessibility for those with disabilities	√		
G. Adequacy of program funding	√	√	√
Total Percentage of Items in Category	**62%**	**22%**	**11%**

Table 4: PQA Item Means and Standard Deviations

	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
I. Learning Environment	4.25	0.51
A. Safe and healthy environment	4.45	0.69
B. Defined interest areas	4.66	0.62
C. Logically located interest areas	4.50	0.72
D. Outdoor space, equipment, materials	4.13	0.92
E. Organization and labeling of materials	4.08	0.89
F. Varied and open-ended materials	4.15	0.81
G. Plentiful materials	4.42	0.86
H. Diversity-related materials	3.80	0.87
I. Displays of child initiated work	4.04	0.91
II. Daily Routine	4.32	0.48
A. Consistent daily routine	4.83	0.47
B. Parts of the day	4.38	0.85
C. Appropriate time for each part of day	4.70	0.63
D. Time for child planning	3.83	1.01
E. Time for child-initiated activities	4.51	0.75
F. Time for child recall	3.69	0.99
G. Small-group time	3.83	1.17
H. Large-group time	4.32	0.77
I. Choices during transition times	4.27	0.83
J. Cleanup time with reasonable choices	4.74	0.57
K. Snack or meal time	4.40	0.76
L. Outside time	4.34	0.89
III. Adult-Child Interaction	4.54	0.43
A. Meeting basic physical needs	4.77	0.49
B. Handling separation from home	4.73	0.55
C. Warm and caring atmosphere	4.77	0.49
D. Support for child communication	4.60	0.66
E. Support for non-English speakers	4.59	0.76
F. Adults as partners in play	4.44	0.79
G. Encouragement of child initiatives	4.79	0.56
H. Support for child learning at group times	4.51	0.77
I. Opportunities for child exploration	4.48	0.77
J. Acknowledgement of child efforts	3.51	1.10
K. Encouragement for peer interaction	4.73	0.59
L. Independent problem solving	4.71	0.61
M. Conflict resolution	4.39	0.79

	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
IV. Curriculum Planning and Assessment	4.30	0.52
A. Curriculum model	4.34	0.92
B. Team teaching	3.83	1.08
C. Comprehensive child records	4.86	0.48
D. Anecdotal note taking by staff	3.81	0.98
E. Use of child observation measure	4.66	0.65
V. Parent Involvement and Family Services	4.58	0.39
A. Opportunities for involvement	4.78	0.52
B. Parents on policy-making committees	3.79	1.13
C. Parent participation in child activities	4.72	0.60
D. Sharing of curriculum information	4.25	0.90
E. Staff-parent informal interactions	4.81	0.50
F. Extending learning at home	4.59	0.69
G. Formal meetings with parents	4.90	0.32
H. Diagnostic/special education services	4.89	0.41
I. Service referrals as needed	4.43	0.82
J. Transition to kindergarten	4.61	0.71
VI. Staff Qualifications and Development	4.53	0.43
A. Program director background	4.41	1.00
B. Instructional staff background	4.24	0.82
C. Support staff orientation and supervision	4.76	0.56
D. Ongoing professional development	4.11	0.89
E. Inservice training content and methods	4.13	0.90
F. Observation and feedback	4.21	0.92
G. Professional organization affiliation	3.76	1.11
VII. Program Management	4.23	0.46
A. Program licensed	4.85	0.55
B. Continuity in instructional staff	4.73	0.69
C. Program assessment	4.51	0.74
D. Recruitment and enrollment plan	4.44	0.78
E. Operating policies and procedures	4.65	0.65
F. Accessibility for those with disabilities	4.54	0.94
G. Adequacy of program funding	3.97	1.14
Total PQA Score	4.39	0.33

Characteristics of MSRP Teaching Staff

In addition of PQA scores, the Mid-Year Reporting process also collects information on the characteristics of MSRP programs and teaching staff. The remaining tables in this report provide descriptive statistics on a range of information. Table 5 provides demographic and qualification information for teaching staff. It is important to note that in Table 5, the training information is not made up of mutually exclusive categories. As a result, the total percentages for this variable exceed 100%. For example, a teacher could have responded that they have earned both and associate's degree and a bachelor's degree. Tables 6 and 7 contain compensation information. In addition to describing teacher compensation, a test for statically significant differences by program type was conducted. As shown in Table 7, lead teachers in school districts have on average higher hourly wages and annual salaries. Their hourly rate is a full $5.35 more per hour and their annual salaries average nearly $20,000 more per year. Finally, Table 8 shows the prevalence of the types of benefits staff receive.

Table 5: Teacher Background Characteristics and Qualifications

	Lead Teacher		Associate Teacher	
	%	**N**	**%**	**N**
Ethnicity				
Native American	0.4	4	0.6	6
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.4	4	0.3	3
African American	9.9	108	20.8	211
Hispanic/Latino	0.9	10	4.5	46
White	88.1	962	73.2	743
Multiracial	0.4	4	0.6	6
Gender				
Male	1.0	11	0.8	8
Female	99.0	1079	99.2	1006
Training				
Associate's degree	13.2	151	23.1	265
CDA credential	12.4	142	46.6	534
Early childhood endorsement	65.6	753	7.0	80
120 hours approved training	9.3	107	25.0	287
Bachelor's degree	52.7	604	15.5	178
Graduate degree	40.3	462	6.4	73
MSRP Teaching Experience				
One year	16.7	183	19.6	198
Two years	10.5	115	12.2	123
Three years	10.7	117	11.5	116
Four years	9.7	106	10.4	105
Five or more years	52.5	575	46.4	470
Additional Teaching Experience				
Less than 1 year	19.7	210	31.2	293
1 to 2 years	19.3	206	14.9	140
3 to 5 years	20.5	219	19.6	184
6 to 10 years	15.1	161	16.6	156
11 to 20 years	17.2	184	13.0	122
more than 20 years	8.2	88	4.7	44
Master Contract				
Yes	70.6	598	57.4	459
No	29.4	249	42.6	341
Early Childhood Specialist				
Yes	22.3	242		
No	77.7	845		
MSRP Project Director				
Yes	16.1	171		
No	83.9	890		

Table 6: Teacher Compensation

	Lead Teacher		Associate Teacher	
	Mean	**S.D.**	**Mean**	**S.D.**
Hourly Salary	17.80	5.9	12.21	9.92
Annual Salary	43,313.80	18,388.73	16,317.81	8,978.72
Hours worked per week	31.59	8.58	29.60	8.11
Weeks worked per year	37.89	4.12	37.28	4.35
Total Benefits Received	5.92	2.22	4.55	2.81

Table 7: Teacher Compensation by Program Type

	School District	Competitive Agency
Lead Teacher		
Hourly Salary***	20.11	14.76
Annual Salary***	45,604.02	25,865.88
Associate Teacher		
Hourly Salary	12.32	11.97
Annual Salary	16,184.44	16,961.97

* p ≤ .05; ** p ≤ .01; *** p ≤ .001

Table 8: Prevalence of Benefits Receipt by Type of Benefit

	Lead Teacher		Associate Teacher	
	%	N	%	N
Benefits Received				
Health Insurance				
Yes	81.9	903	54.3	557
No	18.1	200	45.7	469
Dental Insurance				
Yes	77.0	849	50.9	522
No	23.0	254	49.1	504
Vision Insurance				
Yes	73.8	814	48.5	498
No	26.2	289	51.5	528
Disability Insurance				
Yes	56.8	626	38.5	395
No	43.2	477	61.5	631
Vacation Days				
Yes	41.2	454	37.3	383
No	58.8	649	62.7	643
Sick Days				
Yes	94.5	1042	86.5	139
No	5.5	61	13.5	887
Retirement				
Yes	83.8	924	70.4	722
No	16.2	179	29.6	304
Tax Annuity				
Yes	36.4	402	28.3	290
No	63.6	701	71.7	736
Dependent Care				
Yes	19.7	217	17.0	174
No	80.3	886	83.0	852
Cafeteria Benefits				
Yes	14.1	156	11.3	116
No	85.9	947	88.7	910
Other Benefits				
Yes	12.8	141	12.0	123
No	87.2	962	88.0	903